Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 29 2005
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 05-28

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

RICHARD STEVENS,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The California Supreme Court

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RICHARD STEVENS
Petitioner pro se
221 West 82nd Street
New York, New York 10024
(212) 724-7721
(714) 330-9960

June 29, 2005

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Does Title II of the ADA cover the right of a citizen with a qualified disability to communicate his defense in a judicial proceeding by way of expert opinions, and does the exclusion of such testimony deprive petitioner of an opportunity to be heard ?

2. Does the abrogation of the State's Eleventh Amendment immunity coupled with Title II being the law of the land as of May 17, 2004, override collateral estoppel of a sister state proceeding when the former tribunal unequivocally deprived petitioner of his opportunity to be heard ?

3. Does the present State's refusal to set aside the default judgment deprive petitioner of due process when the documented medical evidence demonstrates that his absence was as a result of a neurological disability ?

RULE 24.1 STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule 24.1 of the Rules of this Court, all of the parties whose judgment is sought to be reviewed, are listed in the caption.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....i

LIST OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES iv

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES vi

TABLE OF APPENDICES xiii

CITATION OF THE REPORTS OF OPINIONS IN THE CASE.....1

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 10

CONCLUSION 30

APPENDIX.....A1

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Page

Point I (A) (i)

Petitioner's qualified disability is acknowledged by Congress. 10

Point I (A) (ii):

The statutory language to Title II makes clear that it applies to various types of qualified disabilities. The range of time and scope is revealed by its history . As a result of this Court's decision in Lane, a higher standard of review exists for qualified citizens with disabilities. This falls under the scope of ¶ 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.....10

[a] Statutory language supports the inclusion of numerous forms of qualified disabilities. Expert testimony to be communicated to Court on behalf of petitioner within scope of Title II.....11

[b]: History of Title II fully supports that the arm of the State that Congress was most concerned with was the judiciary. 13

Point II:

[A]: Maintaining the date of the hearing in light of *Lane* deprived petitioner of meaningful opportunity to be heard. An expedited hearing after May 17, 2004, deprives petitioner of due process.. 17

[B]: Failing to set aside default deprives petitioner of access to court and due process.....19

Point III:

Outright exclusion of neurological expert testimony defeats collateral estoppel. Petitioner has met its burden. [B & P 6049.1(b)(3)] 20

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES *Page*

Point IV:

Expert opinions offered by petitioner are admissible.....21

[A]: Evidence cannot continue to be ignored pursuant to Act of Congress 21

[B]: The neurological recovery process is within the scope of experts special knowledge under FRE and Daubert 22

Point V:

Taking of license by state is a property right effecting petitioner's livelihood. This raises a separate 14th Amendment deprivation and violates the privileges and immunity clause under Article IV ¶ 2 of the Constitution.....26

Point VI:

Title II was at all times the law of the land. Petitioner has standing to raise the effect of Lane as it relates to the Supremacy Clause and abrogation 27

[A]: Supremacy Clause 27

[B]: Abrogation 28

Point VII:

This Court is not bound by the law of the case doctrine. Separate basis for granting petition... 29

CONCLUSION.....30

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES *Page*

Cases

Albertson's Inc. v *Kirkingburg*, 527 U.S. 555 (1999) 16

Alden v *Lane*, 527 U.S. 706 (1999) 28

Alexander v *Margolis*, 921 F. Supp. 482 (1995)
aff'd. 98 F. 3d 1341 (CA6) (1996).....8

Armstrong v *Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545 (1965) 20

Baldwin v *Montana Fish*, 436 U.S. 371 (1978).....26

Bell v *Burson*, 402 U.S. 535 (1971) 26

Bernhard v *Bank of America*,
19 Cal. 2d 805 (1942).....20

Boddie v *Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971)..... .14

Bradley Mining Co. v *Boice*, 345 U.S. 932 (1935) 30

Bragdon v *Abbott*, 524 U.S.624(1998) 16

Buck v *Bell*, 274 U.S. 200 (1927) 14,15

Chislom v *Georgia*, 2 Dall 419 (1793) 28

Cipollone v *Ligget Group Inc.*,
505 U.S. 504 (1992).....28

Cohens v *Virgina*, 6 Wheat 264 (1821) 29

Craig v *Boren*, 429 U.S. 190 (1976) 17

Data Processing Services v *Camp*,
397 U.S. 150 (1970).. 17

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES *Page*

Daubert v *Merryl Dow.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) .....5,.22 -25

Dunn v *Blumstein*, 405 U.S. 330 (1972) 15

Edelman v *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974) 28

Erie R. Co. v *Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....21

Ex Parte Bradley, 7 Wall 364 (1868).....9

Ex Parte Burr, 9 Wheat 529, (1824).....9

Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908) 29

Fitzpatrick v *Bitzer*, 427 U.S. 445 (1976) 28

Fitzgerald v *Dept. of Defense*, 85 M.S.P.R. 463 (2000) ...10

Frazier v *Heebe*, 482 U.S. 641 (1987)..... 9

Friend v *United States*, 517 U.S. 1152 (1996) 30

Fuentes v *United States*, 516 U.S. 1022 (1995) 30

Geer v *Connecticut.*, 161 U.S. 519 (1896) 26

Goldberg v *Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970).....26

Goss v *Lopez*, 419 U.S. 565 (1982) 18

Grove City College v *Bell*, 465 U.S. 555 (1980) 17

Hason v *Department of Health*,
295 A.D. 2d 818 (Third Dep't) (2002) 4,10, 21

Hason v *Medical Board of California*, 279 F. 3d 1167
(CA9) (2002) petition for rehearing en banc denied
294 F. 3d 1166 (CA9) (2002) *Medical Board of Cal.*
v *Hason, cert. granted* 537 U.S.1028 (2002); *cert.*
dismissed 538 U.S. 958 (2003) 27,.29

Hicklin v *Orbeck*, 437 U.S. 518 (1978) 26

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES ***Page***

Hines v Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941).....28

Huffman v *Pursue Ltd.*, 420 U.S. 592 (1975) 29

In re Ruffalo, 390 U.S. 544 (1968).....9

In re Rose, 22 Cal. 4th 430 (2000) 13

In re Stevens, 294 A.D. 2d 1 (2002).....6, 23, 24

In re Snyder, 472 U.S. 634 (1985).....9

Joint Anti-Fascist Committee v *McGrath*,
341 U.S.123 (1951).....19,20

Konigsberg v *State Bar of California*,
353 U.S. 252 (1957).....13

Lane v Tennessee, 315 F. 3d 680 (2003).....3, 27

Logan v *Zimmerman Brush Co.*,455 U.S. 422 (1982) 18

M.L.B. v *S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102 (1996) 14

Mathews v *Eldridge*, 421 U.S. 319 (1976) 18, 20

Matter of Frazier, 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. 676
(Review Dep't) (1991) 19

Memphis Light, Gas, & Water Div. v *Craft*,
436 U.S. 1 (1978) 18

Messenger v *Anderson*, 225 U.S. 436 (1912)..... ..30

Morrissey v *Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972) 19

Nevada Dep't. of Human Resources v *Hibbs*,
538 U.S. 721 (2003) 17

Picquard v *City of East Peoria*,
887 F. Supp. 1106, (C.D. Ill.) (1996) 28

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Popovich v *Cuyahoga County*,
276 F. 3d 808 (CA6) (2002)
cert. denied, 537 U.S. 832 27

Sacher v *Association of the Bar of the City of New York*, 347 U.S. 388 (1954) 9

School Board of Nassau County v *Arline*,
480 U.S. 273 (1987).....17

Seminole Tribe v *Florida* ,517 U.S. 44 (1996) 28

Shapiro v *Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618 (1969).....15

Skinner v *Oklahoma ex. Rel. Williamson*,
316 U.S. 535 (1942) 15

Smith v *Reeves*, 178 U.S. 436 (1900).....29

Snidach v *Family Finance Group*, 395 U.S. 337 (1969) .. 26

Supreme Court of New Hampshire v *Piper*,
470 U.S. 274 (1985). 26

Susie v *Apple Tree Preschool*,
866 F. Supp. 390 (N.D. Iowa 1994) 10

Sutton v *United Airlines*, 527 U.S. 471 (1999) 16

Theard v *United States*, 354 U.S. 278 (1987).....9

Tennessee v Lane, 541 U.S. 509; 124 S. Ct. 1978;
158 L. Ed. 2d 820; 72 U.S.L.W. 4371; (2004)
affirming 315 F. 3d 680 (2003).....*passim*

Toomer v *Witsell*, 334 U.S. 385 (1948).....26

United States v *Georgia*, *cert. granted*, May 16, 2005,
125 S. Ct. 2256; 73 U.S.L.W. 3557; 29

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES ***Page***

United States v *Raines*, 362 U.S. 17 (1960) 16

University of Alabama v *Garrett*,
531 U.S. 356, (2001).....29

Wisconsin v *Constantineau*, 400 U.S. 433 (1971) 20

Wolff v *McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974) 18

Youngberg v *Romeo*, 457 U.S. 307 (1982) 14

Zap v *United States*, 330 U.S. 800 (1947) 30

Constitutional Provisions

Article IV section 2 of the Constitution.....1, 26
Article VI of the Constitution 1, 22, 27-28
Eleventh Amendment of the U.S. Constitution ..... *passim*
Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution .....*passim*
Fourth Article of Confederation 26

Federal Statutes & Regulations

28 C.F.R. ¶ 35.130 (b) (7) 5
29 U.S.C. ¶ 705(21)(a)(iii) 2,10,17
29 U.S.C. ¶ 794a(a)(2) 2
29 U.S.C. ¶ 705 (20)(B) (i) (ii) (iii) 10
Title II of the American Disabilities Act (1990) .....*passim*
42 U.S.C. ¶ 12131 - 12133.....*passim*
42 U.S.C. ¶ 12102 (2) (A) - (C) 1, 2,10
42 U.S.C. 12102 (1) (A-D) 13

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES *Page*

28 U.S.C. ¶ 1257 1

Federal Rules of Evidence ¶ 702 .....22, 24

Federal Rules of Evidence ¶ 703 25

State Statutes

California Business and Professions

Code ¶ 6049.1 (a) (b) (c) (d).....1, 7, 18, 20, 21

California Code of Civil Procedure ¶ 1990.....18

California Rules of Court ¶ 952(a) 1

California Rules of Court ¶ 952 (c) 1, 18

Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of Cal. ¶ 201 (c) 8

Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of Cal. ¶ 300 (L) 1,8

Other Authorities & Publications

Adult Brain Cells Said To Reproduce, by Holcomb B. Noble, published NY Times October 30, 1998.....3

Brain May Grow New Cells Daily, by Nicholos Wade, published NY Times, October 15, 1999, front page.....3

Humanity Maybe its in the Wiring: [re: *Conduits of Emotion*], by Sandra Blakeslee published NY Times, December 9, 2003 at F1 4

Language Gene is Traced to Emergence of Humans, by Nicholos Wade, published NY Times August 15, 2002 page 18 11

Research Dispels Myth That Brain In Adults Is Unable to Renew Itself, by Lawrence Altman, published NY Times, April 18, 1995, at C3.....3